

Koch, Kristine

From: Shephard, Burt
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 1:01 PM
To: PETERSON Jenn L
Cc: Koch, Kristine
Subject: RE: Some follow up on the DDE sediment PRG

Ecological PRGs apply Sitewide, not only to specific river miles for specific target ecological receptors.

Remember that the in water BERA did not evaluate risks from soil. Everything, including beaches up to ordinary high water, is considered sediment in the BERA. This was defined in the conceptual site model within the BERA problem formulation. So LWG's argument about beaches vs sediment is moot, and not correct.

Best regards,

Burt Shephard
Risk Evaluation Unit
Office of Environmental Assessment (OEA-095)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
1200 6th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

Telephone: (206) 553-6359

Fax: (206) 553-0119

e-mail: Shephard.Burt@epa.gov

"Facts are stubborn things"
- John Adams

From: PETERSON Jenn L [<mailto:PETERSON.Jenn@deq.state.or.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 11:17 AM
To: Shephard, Burt
Cc: Koch, Kristine
Subject: RE: Some follow up on the DDE sediment PRG

Hi Burt,

I agree that the sandpiper PRG is similar or lower than the piscivorous bird PRGs, but I thought we needed both because the exposure areas are different. For example, the LWG has argued that the sandpiper PRG cannot be applied to in water sediment, only beaches. They should have separate RALs and PRGs, similar to HH, correct? Doesn't this also impact how you will be monitoring for effectiveness (beach sediment versus in water fish tissue?).

Thanks, this conversation is helpful -

Jennifer

From: Shephard, Burt [<mailto:Shephard.Burt@epa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 11:05 AM
To: PETERSON Jenn L

Cc: Koch, Kristine

Subject: FW: Some follow up on the DDE sediment PRG

Jennifer,

The attached email I sent to Kristine yesterday should answer one of your questions. I looked at the spreadsheet to find the sediment PRG for DDE from the belted kingfisher dietary line of evidence, it was slightly higher than the dietary DDE PRG for spotted sandpiper (12 vs. 7 µg/kg in round figures). I suspect this is because of the much higher sediment ingestion rate for sandpipers compared to that of kingfisher (or eagles and osprey), despite being lower on the food web than the piscivorous birds. Sediment ingestion by sandpipers as part of their diet is also a likely cause of the total DDx sediment PRG for birds via dietary ingestion coming out of the sandpiper dietary line of evidence.

Best regards,

Burt Shephard
Risk Evaluation Unit
Office of Environmental Assessment (OEA-095)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
1200 6th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

Telephone: (206) 553-6359

Fax: (206) 553-0119

e-mail: Shephard.Burt@epa.gov

"Facts are stubborn things"
- John Adams

From: Shephard, Burt
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 11:49 AM
To: Koch, Kristine
Subject: Some follow up on the DDE sediment PRG

Kristine,

FYI, the dietary ingestion for belted kingfisher sediment PRG for DDE is 11.7 µg/kg dry weight sediment, higher than the 7.1 µg/kg sediment PRG for dietary ingestion of DDE by sandpipers. Thus, the 7.1 µg/kg DDE in sediment PRG is the lowest avian PRG, and is the value that should be in our PRG table to LWG.

Regarding sediment PRGs for the avian assessment endpoints from total DDx, the spotted sandpiper total DDx sediment PRG, based on dietary ingestion, is the bird species resulting in the lowest PRG of 76 µg/kg total DDx dry weight sediment. Thus, 76 µg/kg total DDx should be the sediment PRG for birds. EPA and LWG calculated the same 76 µg/kg PRG for total DDx for protection of birds, based on the information available to us.

Best regards,

Burt Shephard
Risk Evaluation Unit
Office of Environmental Assessment (OEA-095)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
1200 6th Avenue

Seattle, WA 98101

Telephone: (206) 553-6359

Fax: (206) 553-0119

e-mail: Shephard.Burt@epa.gov

"Facts are stubborn things"

- John Adams